



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

- (2) Pättāḥ-furtive and the helping pättāḥ in the Perf. 2 f. s. of verbs 'גuttural.
 (3) Letters retained simply for orthographical reasons, as ' in פִּנְיָ.

The syllable-divider is not represented.

Mäqqēph is represented by +.

The transliteration of Zeph. III., 8 furnishes an example of nearly every form.

lā-khēn ḥāk-kû+lî n'ûm+y'hô-vā(h)

l'yôm qû-mî l'ädh

kî mîsh-pā-tî lē-'šōph gô-yîm

l'qō-bh'tsî mām-lā-khōth

lîsh-pōkh 'alē-hēm zā'-mî

kōl ḥ'rôn 'āp-pî

kî b'ēsh qîn-'ā-thî

tē-'ā-khēl kōl+hā-'ā-rēts.

➤BOOK NOTICES.◀

GESENIUS' LEXICON.*

The last two editions of this standard work have been prepared by the Dorpat Professors Mühlau and Volck. The changes introduced in the first of their editions (the eighth in the whole series) were characterized by Prof. Robertson Smith as "not all of them improvements." Dissatisfaction has been more pronounced since the appearance of the last—ninth—edition. First Professor Siegfried devotes over nine columns of the *Theol. Literaturzeitung* to the subject and then Lagarde occupies a whole number of the *Goettingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* with it. A comical turn is given to the procedure by the protest of the editors in reply to Siegfried, which protest amounts only to the assurance that they must express their indignation at his strictures. A dignified silence would have been better for them.

The influence of party feeling is probably to be taken into account in judging such a controversy. The Dorpat theologians are conservative Lutherans of the school of *von Hoffmann*. Their critics are pronounced liberals. Gesenius himself was a rationalist, and Messrs. Siegfried and Lagarde feel that his great work ought not to receive a color which its author would not have given it. In this they are to some extent correct. Gesenius' own work, which has been acceptable to two generations of scholars of all shades of opinions, shows how little one's theological standpoint need interfere with his critical and linguistic study. Until we come to a *biblico-theological* lexicon of the Old Testament, there should be no reason to inquire into the theological views of our lexicographers. If then Mühlau and Volck have been one-sided it is a mistake. A biblico-theological lexicon seems far away in the future.

More serious is the charge made by Prof. Siegfried that the Massoretic text is not used by the authors in its most correct form, especially that Baer's edition of Genesis, Psalms, etc., has not been consulted often enough. A lexicon of the Massoretic text should certainly be based on the Massora. If this text were faith-

* Gesenius' (Wilhelm) Hebraeisches und Chaldaeisches Handwoerterbuch ueber das Alte Testament. Neunte vielfach umgearbeitete Auflage von Prof. F. Muehlau und W. Volck. Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel. 1883. xlvì, 978 pp. Large 8vo.

fully used we should find less fault than the critics are disposed to do when they complain that Mühlau and Volck neglected proposed *emendations* of the text. Doubtless many such emendations are needed and many that have been suggested (especially when based on the versions) will be found acceptable. But the space to which a hand-lexicon is restricted offers a bar to a full statement of such conjectures. Still in the case of obscure words a brief reference to them would not be out of place.

That lack of space can hardly be pleaded for the partial consideration of these proposed changes in the text is evident from the amount given up to doubtful etymologies. The effort of the etymologist is here to trace all trilateral roots back to bilaterals. These bilaterals are supposed first to expand in the ע"ע form as in the example quoted by Lagarde, מרר from a supposed מר. So far so good. There would be no objection if that were all. But when this same מר is made also the father of מרא, מרה, מרח, מרד, מרט, מרץ, מרק, מור, מאר, מחר, מחר, מ'מר—then we begin to shake our heads, all the harder when we find twenty-four trilateral stems (some identical with those already given) written in Arabic letters. In the first place, if we assume a monosyllabic stage for the Semitic language, it is hardly to be supposed that its single root מר could have been so productive—rather it can hardly be supposed that there was such a paucity of monosyllables that each one had to expand into so many trilaterals. In the second place, the reduction of meanings so varied to one primitive notion is a matter of conjecture, and often violent conjecture at that. Thirdly, the method is uncertain. Why should not מרה come from רה and מרץ from רץ—especially in view of the fact that מ is a servile letter in the stage of the language which we actually know? But what is so largely a matter of conjecture might as well be omitted. Fourthly, what is scientifically certain ought not all to be included in a hand-lexicon when its tendency is rather to bewilder than to help the student.

The object of this article is not to reproduce individual criticisms or to defend them. Probably not all of them could be defended, and Lagarde shows himself as usual over-sensitive about neglect of his own publications. One or two interesting remarks may be quoted.

מַאֲכָלָה cannot be the instrument with which one eats—the Semites have always eaten with their fingers.

אָגן is derived from **גָּנָה** to trample. But a wash-basin would break (Lagarde says very rightly) if trampled upon, and it has never been oriental manners to put either hands or feet into the basin.

אל is derived from אול. Lagarde's *Orientalia* might at least have been mentioned. His hypothesis is that it comes from the root אלה = to aspire. God then is the one to whom we aspire—the goal of life.

בָּשָׂר is originally the skin, the complexion. **בָּשָׂר** therefore is to say something which makes a man change color, i. e., to bring him good or bad news.

The two notices from which this is drawn will repay perusal. They are found: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1883, Nov. 17 (No. 23), and *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1884, Apr. 1 (No. 1).

II. P. SMITH.